

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*In re application of:*                 *Rhodes, Lester Kent*  
*Serial No.:*                                 *10/743,630*  
*Filed:*   *12/22/2003*  
*For:*   *Crane Supporting Apparatus*  
*Confirmation No.*                         *7407*  
*Art Unit:*                                     *3654*  
*Examiner:*                                     *Brahan, Thomas J.*

.....

**APPLICANT'S ARGUMENT/REMARKS MADE IN AN AMENDMENT**

The Remarks set forth below are submitted as part of the Applicant's response to the Examiner's *Detailed Action* mailed 10/10/2006 and having a response due by 1/10/2007.

**Remarks**

1. The Remarks' section of the Applicant's August 22, 2006 "Applicant's Argument/Remarks Made in an Amendment" stated:

"In order to more clearly distinguish from the apparatus of *Motoda*, Amended Claim 1 has been re-amended to include a further limitation specifying a mounting frame, and specifying that the pedestal is mechanically linked to the mounting frame, ..." (Emphasis Added)

(See pg. 2 of August 22, 2006 "Applicant's Argument/Remarks Made in an Amendment".) However, as a result of a typographic error, the August 22, 2006 accompanying *Amendment* stated: